

### Remarks/Arguments

The Office Action mailed May 4, 2007 has been reviewed and the comments therein were carefully considered. Claims 1–109 are currently pending. Claims 1-109 stand rejected.

#### Claim Amendment

Applicants have amended Claims 1 and 9 to clarify the claims. Claim 9 was also amended to remove the “means” language. Also, Claims 1, 6, 9, 18, and 21 were amended to change “interfaces” to “interface”. Applicants assert that no new matter has been introduced by these amendments.

#### Claim Rejections Under 35 USC §103

Claims 1-98 and 103-109 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,772,331 hereinafter Hind, in view of U.S. Pub. No. 2005/0028208, hereinafter Ellis et al. Applicants traverse this rejection.

The Office Action on page 2 states that Hind discloses “Authenticating of the second mobile terminal with the first mobile terminal (figs. 1-6, col.7, lines 30-39, col.9, lines 16-61 and col.12, lines 20-42)”. Applicants respectfully disagree. Hind discloses authenticating a **resource**, not a mobile terminal. At Col. 8 lines 54-55, Hind defines a resource, as “a network, a database, a server, and so forth”. Applicants assert that Hind provides no disclosure or suggestion of authenticating a second mobile terminal with a first mobile terminal. Applicants assert that Hind does not disclose this feature.

The Office Action on page 2 states that Hind discloses “Transmitting inhibit rule data to the first mobile terminal via wireless interfaces (col. 12, lines 20-42)”. Applicants respectfully disagree. As a first point, Claim 1 recites “transmitting inhibit rule data **from said second mobile terminal** to said first mobile terminal via wireless interfaces” (before the amendment). As previously described, Hind does not disclose authentication between two mobile terminals.

As a second point, Applicants assert that Hind does not disclose or suggest transmitting **inhibit rule data**. At Col. 12 lines 20-42, Hind describes granting a mobile device access to a resource. There is no disclosure at the cited section, or any other section, of inhibit rule data. Accordingly, Applicants assert that Hind does not disclose or suggest this feature.

The Office Action on the bottom of page 3 to the top of page 4 appears to contradict itself. It first states that Hind discloses the recitation of “inhibiting certain functions ...” and refers to Col. 12 lines 20-42 and Col. 12 line 63 to Col. 13 line 43. However, the Office Action immediately thereafter states that “Hind fails to explicitly teach inhibiting certain functions of the first mobile so that the functions are no longer operable.” Applicants agree that Hind does not disclose or suggest this feature of the invention as claimed.

On page 3, the Office Action then states that Ellis discloses television program guides with parental control to limit access to various guides. The Office action then states: “Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teaching of Ellis into the system of Hind in order to restrict some functions of the device and limit the user to only permitted functions based on the parental control settings.”

Applicants respectfully disagree. First, as previously shown, Hind does not disclose or suggest all the features as recited by Claim 1. Second, the Office Action does not cite any suggestion or motivation from either the Hind or the Ellis reference to combine these references. See MPEP §2143. Accordingly, Applicant asserts that Hind and Ellis, either alone or combined, do not teach or suggest each and every feature as recited in Claim 1, and Claim 1 and all claims dependent upon it are allowable.

Regarding Claim 2, the Office Action states that “As to claim 2, Hind further discloses where the first mobile is able to execute software programs and where the functions comprise an executable software program or a part (col.9, lines 16-61 and col.12, lines 20-42).” Applicants respectfully disagree. There is no disclosure of executable software programs at either of the cited sections of Hind. At these sections Hind merely discloses digital certificates. Applicants

assert that Claim 2 is allowable independently of it depending from an allowable independent claim.

Regarding independent Claim 9, Applicants assert that the arguments presented for Claim 1 also apply for these claims. Further, Applicants note that on page 4 the Office Action states that Hind discloses “where Bluetooth link key generated from a passkey is used for authenticating the mobile remote control (col.1 I , lines 33-46, co1.12, line 53-co1.13, line 43)”. Applicants assert that Hind makes no disclosure at the cited sections, or at any other section of Hind. Applicants assert that Claim 9 and all claims that depend upon it are allowable.

Regarding independent Claim 103, Applicants assert that the arguments presented for Claim 1 also apply for this Claim, and therefore Claim 103 and all claims that depend upon it are allowable.

Claims 99-102 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hind, in view of Ellis et al. and further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,564,047, hereinafter Steele et al. Applicants traverse this rejection. Applicants assert that these claims depend upon allowable independent claims, and are therefore allowable.

**Conclusion**

All rejections having been addressed, Applicants respectfully submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicits prompt notification of the same. Should the Examiner have any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the number set forth below.

Applicants believe there is no fee due in association with the filing of this response, however, should there be any fees due the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any such fees or credit any overpayment of fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0733.

Date: August 3, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

David D. Lowry  
Registration No. 38,538  
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.  
28 State Street, 28<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Boston, MA 02109-1775  
Telephone: 617-720-9600  
Fax: 617-720-9601